## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

RICHARD MAYERS,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 3:14-cv-01755
	)	Judge Campbell / Knowles
CORRECTIONS CORPORATION OF	)	
AMERICA, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

This matter is before the Court upon the pro se prisoner Plaintiff's "Instant Motion for Summery Judgement." Docket No. 148. Defendants have filed a Response in Opposition to the Motion. Docket No. 150.

On November 18, 2015, Judge Campbell entered an Order adopting a Report and Recommendation that had been submitted by the undersigned. Docket No. 136. That Report and Recommendation recommended that Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket No. 106) be granted. Docket No. 130. Judge Campbell's Order stated in relevant part:

Accordingly, Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket No. 106) is GRANTED and this action is DISMISSED. All other pending Motions are DENIED as moot and the Clerk is directed to close the file.

This Order shall constitute the final judgment in this case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

Docket No. 136, p. 2.

The Motion now pending before the Court was filed approximately three weeks after

Judge Campbell dismissed this case, entered a final judgment, and directed the Clerk to close the

file.

Moreover, Plaintiff has not filed a supporting Memorandum of Law as required by Local Rules 7.01(a), nor has he complied with Local Rule 56.01(b).

For the foregoing reasons, the instant Motion (Docket No. 148) should be DENIED AS MOOT.

Under Rule 72(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, any party has fourteen (14) days after service of this Report and Recommendation in which to file any written objections to this Recommendation with the District Court. Any party opposing said objections shall have fourteen (14) days after service of any objections filed to this Report in which to file any response to said objections. Failure to file specific objections within fourteen (14) days of service of this Report and Recommendation can constitute a waiver of further appeal of this Recommendation. *See Thomas v. Arn,* 474 U.S. 140, 106 S.Ct. 466, 88 L. Ed. 2d 435 (1985), *reh'g denied,* 474 U.S. 1111 (1986); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72.

E. Clifton Knowles

United States Magistrate Judge